	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/790,292	WALL, JOHN W.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew O. Savage	1724
All Participants:	Status of Application:	<u> </u>
(1) Matthew O. Savage.	(3)	
(2) Kevin B. Bailey.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 2 September 2005	Time:	•
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.	•	
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 13, 19, 24, 27, and 29.  Prior art documents discussed: Luby (of record) and Kamrath (new).	·	
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		•
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
<u> </u>		
•		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature - if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to amend claim 13 to patenty distinguish over Luby taken in combination with Kamrath. Agreed to change "therein" to -- thereon-- in claims 19, 24, and 27 of which corresponded more closely with the arrangement shown in FIG. 5 of the original drawings. Agreed to amend claim 17 to provide antecedent basis for the step of "exerting said force on said sheroid-shaped member-- recited on lines 7-8 of the claim. Agreed to change "the step" to --a step-- for proper antecedence. See the attached examiner's amendment and reasons for allowance for details.